



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,890	07/21/2003	Bach L. Nguyen	CE10238JI220	7662

24273 7590 05/23/2006

MOTOROLA, INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION
LAW DEPT
8000 WEST SUNRISE BLVD
FT LAUDERDAL, FL 33322

EXAMINER

KOVALICK, VINCENT E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/623,890

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN ET AL.

Examiner

Vincent E. Kovalick

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7 and 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7 and 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Amendment dated March 21, 2006 in response to USPTO Office Action dated September 21, 2005.

The amendments to claims 1, 7 and the cancellation of claims 2, 4, 8, and 16-20 have been noted and entered in the record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull et al. (USP 6,720,863) taken with Kopp et al. (Pub. No. US 2003/02532800 in view Tendler (Pub. No. US 2003/0109244).

Relative to claim 1, Hull et al. **teaches** a mobile electronic communication device with light to indicate received messages (col. 1, lines 36-67 and col. 2, lines 1-22); Hull et al. further **teaches** an interface for coupling to a wireless device, comprising: a plurality of buttons for entering information, said buttons illuminated by at least one multicolor LED (col. 10, lines 12-52 and Fig. 7). It being understood that the wireless device would have to contain a circuit board to support the button LED's.

Art Unit: 2629

Hull et al. **does not teach** a connector disposed on the circuit board for connecting the interface to the wireless device; and a selector for allowing a use to define a color of light for emission by the at least one multicolor LED; wherein the interface is detachable coupled to the wireless device.

Kopp et al. **teaches** a wireless handheld device having a detachable keypad (pg. 1, paras. 0006-0021); Kopp et al. further **teaches** a circuit board disposed behind the plurality of buttons disposed on the circuit board (pg. 2, para. 0034; pg. 3, para. para. 0051 and Fig. 8a); wherein the interface is detachable coupled to the wireless device (pg. 2, para 0034); and a connector disposed on the circuit board for connecting the interface to the wireless device (pg. 3, para 0051).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Hull et al. the feature as taught Kopp et al. in order to put in place the means to accommodate the circuitry to relay the information identified by each of the said plurality of buttons and to further facilitate connection of the interface to the wireless device and enabling detaching of the interface from the wireless device.

Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. **does not teach** a selector for allowing a use to define a color of light for emission by the at least one multicolor LED.

Tendler **teaches** a wireless phone based system (pgs. 1&2, paras. 0006-9922); Tendler further **teaches** a selector for allowing a use to define a color of light for emission by the at least one multicolor LED (pg. 1, para. 0012 and Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2629

to provide to the device as taught by Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. the feature as taught by Tendler in order provide the means to facilitate changing the light emitted by the multicolor LED.

Relative to claim 6, Hull et al. further **teaches** the said interface wherein each of the at least one multicolor LED comprises a tricolor LED for emitting any one of red light, green light and yellow light. It being understood the multicolor LED could also include blue light (col. 10, lines 42-53).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Mosebrook et al.(USP 5,905,442).

Regarding claim 3, Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler **does not teach** said interface further comprising a light pipe for allowing light emitted from the at least one multicolor LED for be emitted from the plurality of buttons, the light pipe located between the at least one multicolor LED and the plurality of buttons.

Mosebrook et al. **teaches** an apparatus for controlling and determining the status of electrical devices from remote locations (col. 4, lines 18-67 and col. 5, lines 1-65); Mosebrook et al. further **teaches** said interface further comprising a light pipe for allowing light emitted from the at least one multicolor LED to be emitted from the plurality of buttons, the light pipe located between the at least one multicolor LED and the plurality of buttons.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 2629

to provide to the device as taught by Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler the feature as taught by Mosebrook et al. in order to provide the means to reflect the various colors from the multicolor LEDs to show in conjunction with the plurality of buttons.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Dobler (Pub. No. 2003/0185371).

Regarding claim 5, Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler **does not teach** said interface wherein the plurality of buttons comprises twelve buttons, the twelve buttons representing the twelve standard DTMF buttons.

Dobler **teaches** a status reminder for a communication device (pg. 1, paras. 0001-0005); Dobler further **teaches** said interface wherein the plurality of buttons comprises twelve buttons, the twelve buttons representing the twelve standard DTMF buttons (pg. 2, para. 0019).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler the feature as taught Dobler in order to provide the twelve standard DMF buttons commonly found on all telephones.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler as applied to claim 1 in item 3 hereinabove, and further in view of Dobler taken with Mosebrook

Relative to claim 7, Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler **does not teach** a wireless device interface for communication with a wireless network; or a light pipe for allowing light emitted from the at least one multicolor LED to be emitted from the plurality of

Art Unit: 2629

buttons, the light pipe located between the at least one multicolor LED and the plurality of buttons.

Dobler **teaches** a status reminder for a communication device (pg. 1, paras. 0001-0005); Dobler further **teaches** a wireless device interface for communication with a wireless network (pg. 1, para. 0017).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler the feature as taught by Dobler in order to put in place the means necessary to communicate with other devices reached over the wireless network.

Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler and further in view of Dobler **does not teach** or a light pipe for allowing light emitted from the at least one multicolor LED to be emitted from the plurality of buttons, the light pipe located between the at least one multicolor LED and the plurality of buttons.

Mosebrook et al. **teaches** an apparatus for controlling and determining the status of electrical devices from remote locations (col. 4, lines 18-67 and col. 5, lines 1-65); Mosebrook et al. further **teaches** a light pipe for allowing light emitted from the at least one multicolor LED to be emitted from the plurality of buttons, the light pipe located between the at least one multicolor LED and the plurality of buttons (col. 15, lines 31-57)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Hull et al. taken with Kopp et al. in view of Tendler taken with Dobler the feature as taught by Mosebrook et al. in order to provide the means to reflect the various colors from the multicolor LEDs to show in conjunction with the plurality of buttons.

Art Unit: 2629

7. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paolini et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0067444) taken with Cornelissen et al. (USP 6,329,968) in view of Kerr (Pub. No. US 2003/0002246).

Regarding claim 9, Paolini et al. **teaches** a color isolated backlight for an LCD (pg. 1, paras. 0013-0015); Paolini et al. further **teaches** a light guide for use in a wireless device, comprising a first light conducting element for receiving light from a first set of at least one LED, the first set of at least one LED being integrally formed with the wireless device (pg. 4, claim 15).

Paolini et al. **does not teach** and a second light conducting element for receiving light from a second set of at least one LED, the second set of at least one LED being detachable coupled with the wireless device; or a third light conducting element for conducting light from the first set and the second set of at least one LED to backlight the LCD.

Cornelissen et al. **teaches** a display device (col. 1, lines 43-67; col. 2, lines 1-67 and col. 3, lines 1-17); Cornelissen et al. further **teaches** a second light conducting element for receiving light from a second set of at least one LED, the second set of at least one LED being detachable coupled with the wireless device (col. 3, lines 42-52 and Fig. 1)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Paolini et al. the feature as taught by Cornelissen et al. in order to provide for adding the feature to the wireless device of adapting an addition light source to the said wireless device.

Paolini et al taken with Cornelissen et al. **does not teach** a third light conducting element for conducting light from the first set and the second set of at least one LED to backlight the LCD.

Kerr **teaches** an active enclosure for computing devices (pg. 1, paras. 0010-0016); Kerr further

Art Unit: 2629

teaches a third light conducting element for conducting light from the first set and the second set of at least one LED to backlight the LCD (pg. 9, para. 0095 and Fig. 18A).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Paolini et al. taken with Cornelissen et al. the feature as taught by Kerr in order to provide additional illumination for the backlight of the wireless device.

Regarding claim 10, Paolini et al. further **teaches** the said light guide wherein the first light conducting element includes at least one rectangular shaped elongated element having one end disposed adjacent to an LED of the first set of at least one LED (pg. 2, para. 0024).

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paolini et al. taken with Cornelissen et al. in view of Kerr as applied to claim 10 in item 7 hereinabove, and further in view of Tanaka et al. (USP 6,474,826).

Relative to claim 11, Paolini et al. taken with Cornelissen et al. in view of Kerr **does not teach** the said light guide wherein the second light conducting element includes at least one rectangular-shaped elongated element having one end disposed adjacent to a LED of the second set of at least one LED.

Tanaka et al. **teaches** a lighting apparatus (col. 1, lines 46-64); Tanaka et al. further **teaches** the said light guide wherein the second light conducting element includes at least one rectangular-shaped elongated element having one end disposed adjacent to a LED of the second set of at least one LED (col. 3, lines 25-39 and Fig. 10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Paolini et al. taken with Cornelissen et al. in view of Kerr the

Art Unit: 2629

feature as taught by Tanaka et al. in order to provide a light guide with the shape that best adapts to a small wireless device and can interface with the device LEDs.

9. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over al. Paolini et al. taken with Cornelissen et al. in view of Kerr as applied to claim 9 in item 7 above, and further in view of Dobler.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Paolini et al. taken with Cornelissen et al. in view of Kerr **does not teach** a wireless device interface for communication with a wireless network.

Dobler **teaches** a wireless device interface for communication with a wireless network (pg. 1, para. 0017).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide to the device as taught by Paolini et al. taken with Cornelissen et al. in view of Kerr the feature as taught by Dobler in order to provide the means for the said wireless device to communicate over a wireless network.

10. Regarding claim 14, the remarks presented with regard to claim 10 in item 7 hereinabove, apply equally to claim 14.

11. Regarding claim 15, the remarks presented with regard to claim 11 in item 8 hereinabove, apply equally to claim 15

Response to Applicant's Remarks

12. Applicant's remarks relative to claims 1 and 7 are rendered moot in that additional prior art was introduced in the rejection of said claims 1 and 7 to address the new limitations added in the amendments to said claims 1 and 7.

Applicant's remarks relative to claims 9 and 12 are rendered moot with the introduction of new prior art used in the rejection of said claims 9 and 12.

Conclusion

13 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No.	6,501,581	Snyder et al.
Pub. No.	US 2003/0222148	Schmidt et al.
Pub. No.	US 2003/0095525	Lavin et al.
Pub. No.	US 2002/-172039	Inditsky

To Respond

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E. Kovalick whose telephone number is 571-272-7669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30- 4:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 571-272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Vincent E. Kovalick

May 17, 2006



BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER